

· Appl. No. : 09/552,383
Filed : April 19, 2000

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 20, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 30-37 and 56-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee et al. reference in view of the Sandhu et al. reference. By this paper, the Applicant has amended the claims of the application to distinguish the cited references.

Specifically, the Applicant has amended Claim 30 to indicate that the conductive material is positioned directly on the sacrificial layer as opposed to having a glue layer interposed between the conductive material and the sacrificial layer. The Lee reference specifically discloses such a glue layer 210 which affects the subsequence CMP process and also results in an additional process step. As such, the Applicant believes that Claim 30 and Claim 57 which has a similar limitation, distinguishes over the Lee reference. Moreover, the Applicant further notes that Sandhu fails to teach this combination as well. As a consequence, the Applicant believes that Claims 30 and 57 distinguish over the art of record. The Applicant further submits that the remaining claims define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable as a result of their respective dependencies on Claims 30 and 57. The Applicant, therefore, believes that the above-captioned application is in condition for allowance and requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 7/14/05

By: [Signature]

Michael H. Trenholm
Registration No. 37,743
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(951) 781-9231